

## REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 33 and 35 under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner states that there is no support for the limitation found in claims 33 and 35 "wherein the pharmaceutical composition is administered at a dosage of about 1 mg/kg".

The Examiner focuses on the text of Example 4 to show that only three distinct dosages are explicitly discussed and used to generate experimental data. However, the Figures associated with that Example, and in particular Figures 3C and Figures 7C, implicitly support that the Applicants envisioned using (R,R'),(R,S')-amphetaminil at a dosage of about 1 mg/kg rather than only at a dosage of 1 mg/kg. Figures 3C and Figures 7C show dose response curves for (R,R'),(R,S')-amphetaminil showing changes in locomotor activity (Figure 3C) and stereotypy (Figure 7C). These Figures show implicit support for the language "about 1 mg/kg".


Furthermore, the Examiner states that use of a 100% DMSO vehicle does not provide adequate description to support a specific amount of the claimed amphetaminil compound in any pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, diluent, excipient or additive.

Amended claims 33 and 35 now only list a pharmaceutically acceptable diluent to simplify the claim. Page 14, line 9 through 14, describes diluents as inert materials that increase the volume of a therapeutic and list a selection of diluents. The specification provides support for the language "a pharmaceutically acceptable diluent".

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments and remarks place the claims in condition for allowance. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. No fees are believed due for an extension of time due to the filing of this paper.

Any questions about this response should be addressed to Karen Guerrero. The telephone number is 610-933-2490.

Sincerely,

  
Karen Guerrero  
Registration No. 37,071